

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-27 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 20, 24, and 27 being the independent claims. Claims 28-30 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, at paragraphs [0101]-[0103] of the instant application.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states:

Claim 1 recites the phrase: “said transmitter unit comprising a header compression unit adapted for converting a primary header of a data packet to be transmitted into a corresponding secondary header”. In view of the present claim language, it is unclear to the examiner *how can* a converted primary header be *transmitted into* a corresponding secondary header.

See Office Action, page 2 (emphasis in the original). Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 to further clarify the subject matter therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-19 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claim 29 in the above Amendment to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claim 29 in the above Amendment to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claim 29 in the above Amendment to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Bornemisza

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9, 18, 19, 24-26 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being alleged unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,154,895 to Bornemisza *et al.* (“Bornemisza”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1 and 24 have been amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, a secondary header that “consists of a single byte comprising an entry number for a header lookup table and an unmodified Payload Type Identifier copied from the primary header.” Bornemisza does not teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claims 1 and 24.

Furthermore, independent claims 1 and 24 have been amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, a modified data packet “having a **fixed** packet size” (emphasis added). Bornemisza does not teach or suggest at least this feature. The Examiner, with respect to now canceled dependent claim 4, contends that Bornemisza teaches of a modified data packet “having a fixed packet size,” as recited by claims 1 and 24. Specifically, the Examiner refers to col.7, ll. 29-67 of Bornemisza as allegedly teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bornemisza describes a differential based compression scheme for ATM headers. Compression of the ATM headers using differential based compression is achieved primarily by sending the difference between ATM headers of consecutive packets. Bornemisza describes the use of three encoding techniques to implement this differential based compression—each compression technique being implemented depending on the number of bits that change for a previous header to a current packet header. *See* Bornemisza, col. 7, ll. 36-39; col. 7, ll. 48-51; and col. 8, ll. 1-3. In general, the more bits that change from a previous header to a current header, the less compression that can be achieved. Consequently, as described by Bornemisza:

It is evident from the example shown in FIGS. 5A, 5B, and 5C that the header may become variable length based upon the encoding technique

See Bornemisza, col. 8, ll. 27-29. As is clear from the above, the compressed data packets of Bornemisza do **not** have a fixed packet size. Depending on the encoding technique, “the header may become variable length,” which results in a non-fixed packet size. *Id.*

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 24 are patentable over Bornemisza. Claims 2-9, 18 and 19 depend from claim 1; claims 25-26 depend from claim 24. Dependent claims 2-9, 18, 19 and 25-26 are similarly patentable over Bornemisza for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 24, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1-9, 18, 19 and 24-26 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 28-30 have been cancelled by the above Amendment, thereby rendering the rejection of claims 28-30 moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 28-30 be withdrawn.

Agarwal

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 10-17, 20, 21 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being alleged unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,963,570 to Agarwal (“Agarwal”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 20 and 27 have been amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, a secondary header that “consists of a **single** byte comprising an entry number for a header lookup table and an **unmodified** Payload Type Identifier” (emphasis added). Agarwal does not teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claims 1, 20 and 27.

For at least the foregoing reason, independent claims 1, 20 and 27 are patentable over Agarwal. Claims 10-17 depend from claim 1; claim 21 depends from claim 20. Dependent claims 10-17 and 21 are similarly patentable over Agarwal for at least the same reason as claims 1 and 20, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1, 10-17, 20, 21 and 27 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 4/7/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

804157_1.DOC